REMARKS

Claims 1, 2-4, 6, 9, 10-14, 18, 22, and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,396,476 to Bradski et al. (hereinafter Bradski) in view of United States Patent Number 5,396,600 to Thompson et al. (hereinafter Thompson). Claims 5, 7, 8, 17, 19-21, 23, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski in view of Thompson and in further view of United States Patent Number 6,664,990 to Bates et al. (hereinafter Bates).

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview of May 10, 2007. We discussed a proposed amendment distinguishing that feedback is a dialog listing buffered event quantities and buffered event types for the buffered pointing device events and pointing device events passed to a receiving process. Applicant agreed to submit the amendment.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 with the limitation of claim 8, specifying that the feedback comprises "…a dialog listing the buffered event quantity and the buffered event type…" The amendment is also supported by the specification. Page 10, ¶ 35. Applicant has further amended claim 1 with the limitation "…wherein the feedback module is device driver residing on the driver level of an operating system…" Claim 1 as amended. The amendment is well supported by the specification. Page 9, ¶ 31.

Applicant has amended claims 5, 7, 17-21, and 23 to conform with other amendments. Claims 6, 8, 20, and 30 are canceled.

<u>Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)</u>

Claims 1, 2-4, 6, 9, 10-14, 18, 22, and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Bradski in view of Thompson. Claims 5, 7, 8, 17, 19-21, 23, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski in view of Thompson and in further view of Bates. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 as amended include the limitation "…the feedback comprising a dialog listing the buffered event quantity and the buffered event type for the buffered pointing device events and the pointing device events passed to a receiving process…" Bradski and Thompson do not teach feedback comprising a dialog listing the buffered event quantity and the buffered event type for the buffered pointing device events and the pointing device events passed to a receiving process. Applicant therefore submits that claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 are allowable. Applicant further submits that claims 3-5, 7, 9, 12-14, 17-19, 21-23, and 26 are allowable as depending from allowable claims. Claims 6, 8, 20, and 30 are canceled.

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicant asserts that the application is in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

   /Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler

Reg. No. 38,527

Attorney for Applicant

Date: May 11, 2007

8 East Broadway, Suite 600

Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Telephone (801) 994-4646

Fax (801) 531-1929